Tells the Facts and Names the Names

$2.50

CounterPunch

August, 2005 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* VOL. 12, NO. 14

Can Cindy Sheehan End the War?

By Alexander Cockburn

You can tell in five-minutes channel surfing how Cindy Sheehan frightens the pro-war cYou can tell in five-minutes channel surfing how Cindy Sheehan frightens the pro-war crowd. A bereaved mother from Vacaville, camped outside Bush's home in Crawford, reproaching the vacationing President for sending her son to a pointless death in Iraq has got the White House ordering the hellhounds of the right to bark in venomous unison, which they duly did.

Bill O'Reilly howled about Sheehan's low character in her refusal to pay federal taxes that might put more money the Pentagon's way. Christopher Hitchens sank lower still, attacking Sheehan as a LaRouchie and anti-Semite.

Listening to O'Reilly and even mainstream pundits, you'd think tax-resistance was a fresh and terrible arrival on the shores of American protest, instead of a form of resistance as old as the Republic.

The aim of any serious anti-war protest is to force a government to quit fighting, pull the troops out, come home right now. But Sheehan is castigated in the press, by mainstream liberals as well as mad-dog rightists, for not leaving any wriggle-room on this central point. She says, Bring the troops home right now.

How many people echo that straightforward demand? Millions of ordinary Americans – around 34 per cent – certainly do, if we are to believe the numbers in polls that also give Bush an approval rating of only 34 per cent for his conduct of the war.

(**Sheehan** *continued on page 6)*

What's the Matter with Oklahoma?

By ROXANNE DUNBAR-ORTIZ

By the time I was coming of age in the 1950s, Oklahoma had been for over two decades a tightly run proto-fascist state, with oil and wheat keeping a small ruling class superwealthy and the rest of the population poor and ignorant, under the guidance of fundamentalist preachers. That ruling class controlled every institution, including the media. Those of us who disagreed were expected to go somewhere else, and those of us who were able did so, leaving a hard core of corporate control and a fearful population. Oklahoma's transition from traditional Dixiecrat Democrat to right-wing Republican, like the South as a whole, followed the Republican Party's "southern strategy" of the Nixon era.

My memoir of growing up in Oklahoma, *Red Dirt*, first appeared in 1997. At that time, the "red state-blue state" description distinguishing Republican and Democratic political parties had not yet been created. Red is supposed to be the color that indicates Republican and blue for Democratic. Of course, nothing is that simple. Some states have razor-thin majorities of one or the other, while other states have significant other color regions or cities than the state as a whole. Yet, one thing is certain: Oklahoma fits comfortably into the red state category, and has for some time, long before the signifiers were coined.

That was not always the case. "Red" in the title of *Red Dirt* predated the label "red" for right wing, but it can be added to the litany of reasons I chose that title. I was thinking, first, of the red soil in rural Canadian County, Oklahoma, where I grew up and where my father tried to scratch out a living as a tenant farmer. Secondly, Oklahoma originally was territory that the federal government established as a homeland for the Indians that it forcibly removed from the Southeast during the 1830s. My mother was in part descended from those "red" people. Third, my paternal grandfather was a Socialist and a Wobbly, active in the Socialist Party and in the Industrial Workers of the World. He and other Reds were victims of the Wilson administration's "red scare." Not only my grandfather, but also at least 20 per cent of Oklahomans during that time were "reds," and many more were sympathetic. The Socialist Party won local elections all over the state, and a significant per centage of voters supported their own presidential candidate in five elections. Their activity and general pro-unionism in Oklahoma created the most pro-worker state constitution in the country.

How I came to disagree with prevailing Oklahoman ideology in the 1950s can be attributed to two family secrets that were whispered in oblique stories. One was about my mother's mother being part Indian. The other was about my father being a Red – a radical socialist and member of the IWW. The secret about being part Indian was kept, because it was both dangerous and shameful to be an Indian in Oklahoma before the 1960s. My father told me stories about his Wobbly father warning me to keep it a secret, because it was dangerous and shameful to be a Red at the time, the communist witch hunting time of "McCarthyism." Somehow, those secrets became the core of my imagination and identity.

This experience has informed me in assessing the present red-blue configuration, with Protestant fundamentalism,

(**Oklahoma** *continued on page 4)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is the Dollar Still Falling?

The Latest Twists in Global Neoliberalism

By Robert Pollin

In his classic work, *The General Theory*, published in the depths of the 1930s Depression, John Maynard Keynes famously observed that "Speculators may do no harm as bubbles on a steady stream of enterprise. But the position is serious when enterprise becomes the bubble on a whirlpool of speculation. When the capital development of a country becomes a by-product of the activities of a casino, the job is likely to be ill-done."

Keynes' Depression-forged insights have been routinely reaffirmed over the subsequent 70 years of global capitalist history, not least during the current movements of decline, revival, and renewed drop in the value of the dollar in global currency markets. And as Keynes emphasized, the main issue here is not merely the behavior of financial markets, which never has been more rational or socially redeeming than Las Vegas or Monte Carlo (as was obvious during the Wall Street bubble years under Clinton).

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business
Becky Grant

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

The real issue is rather how the behavior of financial markets defines the limits of acceptable economic policies about things that matter well beyond the confines of the casino, like unemployment, the distribution of income, and the economic possibilities for our children.

In a piece published here last April, I wrote that "Between January 2002 and December 2004, the dollar fell by 34 per cent relative to the euro, and 22 per cent relative to the Japanese yen. The prospect is for the dollar to keep declining at least through 2005." I was accurate then in describing what the *prospect* had been at that moment. But in fact, between April and August 2005, events have rendered that prospect increasingly uncertain. Between May 1 and July 1 of this year, the dollar rose by 7.7 per cent against the euro and by 6.3 per cent against the yen. Then, between July 4 and August 15, the dollar fell back by 3.7 per cent against the euro and 2.1 per cent against the yen.

One of the main points of my April piece was to explore the factors that would work against the continued dollar decline that proceeded through 2002 - 2004, and would, more generally, produce a more uncertain future path for the dollar than was being widely asserted at the time. The first and most straightforward factor that I had mentioned was that U.S. policymakers themselves would not passively allow a dollar collapse. I said then that the key policy tool for the U.S. to support the dollar against the darkening opinion of global currency speculators was to raise interest rates, i.e. sweeten the interest rate returns for global bond purchasers if they keep holding their wealth in U.S. dollar bonds. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has done just that in the ensuing months, having pushed up the Fed's main monetary policy rate (the federal funds rate) from 2.75 to 3.5 per cent just since April, and with promises of more increases to come.

I also said that any movement among European policy makers away from the neoliberal policy agenda that has prevailed for roughly two decades would spook currency markets and push the euro down against the dollar. Neoliberalism in Europe, including low government deficits and high interest rates, have conspired to maintain unemployment in the range of 10 per cent for a most of the past 20 years in most European countries.

European elites appear just as committed to neoliberalism in the fall as they were in April. But the European people have made it clear that they've had enough. The most vehement expression of this sentiment came when voters in France and the Netherlands both decisively rejected the European Union constitution last May. Global currency speculators did not miss this unequivocal message from the European voters, even while European politicians expressed disgust over the people's irresponsibility. The EU's then President Jean-Claude Junker of Luxembourg declared that "This evening, Europe no longer inspires people to dream."

A third change in the global currency landscape since April was something I did not discuss in the earlier piece – the decision last month by the Chinese to allow their currency, the yuan, to adjust slightly upward relative to the dollar. The Bush administration had been lobbying heavily for the Chinese to make this move, given that a low-valued yuan helps the Chinese to keep pushing cheap imports onto the shelves of Wal-Marts and the rest of the U.S. market. This makes the U.S. trade deficit - our purchases of imports in excess of our sales of exports - grow correspondingly. The trade deficit, in turn, along with the federal government's $400 billion budget deficit, are the primary forces pushing the dollar onto its downward trajectory in the first place.

U.S. policymakers have long complained that the Chinese haven't truly embraced the rules of neoliberal global

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism, giving themselves an unfair advantage by holding down the value of the yuan. This is entirely true. For decades now, the Chinese have been ignoring neoliberal precepts in this and many other ways, through which disdain they have produced something approximating to the fastest rate of sustained economic growth in world history. One would think that this new Chinese gesture– and to date nobody,including probably the Chinese themselves, knows whether this move amounts to more than a token nod in behalf of U.S. sensibilities – will immediately work to nudge the dollar back onto the downward path that prevailed between 2002 and 2004, at least at first. This is because with the dollar now being less valuable relative to the yuan, it is correspondingly also less valuable for everyone else in the world that has been using dollars to purchase imports from China...." However, if a more expensive yuan does contribute to a smaller U.S. trade deficit, the net result from the smaller trade deficit could be to push the dollar back up.

Still another possibility is that, with the dollar cheapened relative to the yuan, the Chinese may then decide to stop purchasing U.S. government bonds as heavily as they have done the past few years. The purpose of U.S. bond purchases by the Chinese (along with an even more voracious customer, the Japanese) was to prevent the dollar from falling too rapidly, which would thereby render Chinese products more expensive in the U.S. market. However if the Chinese did decide to cut back on their U.S. bond purchases, this would produce serious downward pressures on the dollar against the euro and other currencies, not simply against the yuan. Alan Greenspan would then likely push U.S. interest rates still higher in self-defense. The U.S., in short, may not find itselfs entirely enamored with the exchange rate policy it desired for from China.

Such uncertainty is the very stuff on which the global currency casino thrives. Is the dollar going to keep rising, as it did between April and July, or return to its downward trajectory of the previous two years? The dice keep rolling. As Lord Keynes, again, famously remarked, "on such matters, we simply do not know."

Still, whether or not the dollar continues falling was not the main question I posed last April. My main concern was rather, would a dollar decline be good or bad news? Nothing has changed since April to undermine my basic point then, which is, there is no simple answer to that question, not least because the question inevitably itself pushes us well beyond the environs of the financial market casino. We can't consider whether a dollar decline is good or bad news without asking, "for whom?" Wall Street? U.S. manufacturers? U.S. workers? French, Dutch or Chinese capitalists or workers? How about South African workers? The answers don't break down easily along well-defined political lines.

Thus, under neoliberalism, U.S. workers have been badly hurt by the U.S. trade deficit and globalization more generally, since it increasingly places them in competition for jobs with workers elsewhere. U.S. workers therefore benefit from a weaker dollar, since a weak dollar makes it easier to sell U.S. products in foreign markets and harder for imports to compete with U.S.-based manufacturers. But U.S. workers would benefit far more from an anti-neoliberal commitment to full employment policies in the U.S., something akin to what the French and Dutch voters appeared to be effectively endorsing in May. A full employment program in the U.S., as well as France and the Netherlands, would also benefit workers in other countries as well, including those in poor countries. If governments in rich countries were committed to creating jobs for their residents, then differences over trade policies and exchange rates – the struggle to 'beggar-thy-neighbor,' to create more jobs at home by taking jobs away from neighboring countries– would diminish to a second-order problem.

But as long as exchange rates and trade policy remain a first-order problem, the U.S. does face a serious and unavoidable trap, which is the legitimate source of the hand-wringing about the dollar's decline from 2002 to 2004. Even without the help of the Japanese and Chinese purchasing U.S. government bonds at their recent heavy rates, the U.S. can probably counteract the long-term downward pressure on the dollar generated by our persistent trade and budget deficits. But the Fed will have to keep raising U.S. interest rates to accomplish this. Persistently rising interest rates will then push the U.S. toward recession, especially given that the U.S. housing market bubble is founded on this now cracking foundation of low interest rates.

The threat of recession therefore hangs heavily over the remainder of the Bush/Greenspan era, with the fundamental problems extending well beyond simply the ups and downs of the dollar. But this should be no surprise, given that Bush/Greenspan, just as with Clinton/Greenspan, have never wavered in behalf of a fundamentally neoliberal agenda. The real issue is therefore the one that that French and Dutch voters pushed into the faces of Europe's elites last May: how long will neoliberalism continue to call the shots, defining the limits of acceptable economic policy?

The threat of recession therefore hangs heavily over the remainder of the Bush - 2/Greenspan era, with the fundamental problems extending well beyond simply the ups and downs of the dollar.

The answer to that question, ultimately, is about politics and not economics. Neoliberalism will continue to make the material circumstances of life worse for the overwhelming majority of people throughout the world. But the Alan Greenspans of the world also know how to prevent full-blown economic meltdowns.

So opponents of neoliberalism therefore can't simply wait for Greenspan and company to slip up and allow a calamity to happen.

The historical transition away from 25 years of neoliberal ascendancy will only come when the "no" to neoliberalism votes, such as in France and the Netherlands, can be transformed into positive and successful programs and movements throughout the world. CP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Oklahoma** *continued from page 1*)

laisser-faire capitalism, and super patriotism linked with war, the ruling political ideology. Having grown up Southern Baptist and super-patriotic, I know what it is like to view the world that way and how powerless I felt to effect change, but how alternate information can be transformative, particularly a knowledge of history, not from the official history record. People should not have to leave oppression to be free; they need to be able to resist, and most people don't see voting as an effective means of resistance. Some 60 per cent of eligible voters in the United States do not vote in national elections. Only 20 per cent of the U.S. population claim to be fundamentalist Christians, surely a mighty number when mobilized, but that doesn't mean the other 80 per cent agree with the right-wing agenda that the Christian right offers.

Perhaps more important than the symbolism of the color red is the question why it has changed meaning. Thomas Frank in his 2004 bestseller, *What's the Matter with Kansas? How Conservatives won the Heart of America,* asks the same question about Kansas, but his answer does not satisfy me. Frank appears to idealize the Roosevelt New Deal era of the Democratic Party, as do most elected officials and activists in that party. Furthermore, he takes for granted that the New Deal really was about the poor and working people. My father used to tell me that Roosevelt had saved the bankers and the rich in general but did not change the condition of the unrich, nor was he interested in doing so.

Roosevelt's interest was rescuing the capitalist system and preventing a workers' revolution in the United States. One would expect a young and brilliant intellectual like Frank to offer some new ideas, but the best he can come up with is that Kansas workers and small farmers act against their own economic interests in voting for Republican Party candidates – they should vote for John Kerry's capitalism and war rather than Bush's capitalism and war. Frank blames the Democratic Party in part for losing white workers and farmers, although he blames disempowered Kansans themselves for being ignorant of their true interests. Frank writes that the Democratic Party has abandoned workers and the poor in favor of cultural rights and the money of wealthy donors, and that the right-wing media has been able to stereotype liberals as coastal big cities elites.

I think the problem is deeper and more historical and that change will require a rethinking of what kind of future we would like to see and what is possible in the world as it has developed. Thomas Frank does not talk about land and loss of land. European settlers, mainly from England, Scotland, and Ireland, were overwhelmingly farmers, peasants, from generations of the same. They came to North America for land to farm. With the support of the British colonial institutions, and later the United States government and military, they appropriated land from the indigenous farmers, a kind of original sin that has not been acknowledged and dealt with.

Poor farmers, without slaves, the great majority of white settler farmers, could not compete on the market with the free (enslaved Africans) labor enjoyed by plantation operators. But, they could raise their own food and feed their families, and even have some surplus to sell or barter. And in working the land, they came to love the land. With the 1846-48 United States war against Mexico, the northern half of Mexico became the U.S. southwest, bringing in more small farmers, both indigenous and Mexican. Following the Civil War and emancipation, Africans were freed from enslavement, and many received reparations in land taken from plantation owners or in new territories that had been seized, including in Oklahoma.

Ideologically, there is no originality in neo-cons' ideas and the more abstract notions they advocate on the national purpose and uses of power are quite traditional.

The United States was a land of farmers, from first settlement to the industrial revolution that took off in the 1830s. By 1880, a little over 50 per cent of the population was farming, declining to 17 per cent in 1940, to about two per cent today. What happened to those who would be farmers? Were they no longer needed? Growing food remained and will remain a necessity, but large corporations took over the land and displaced individual farmers. Patriotism to a distant government and to a flag and other symbols, indeed to wars in distant lands has filled the black hole left by loss of land and love of the land, love of farming. Would anyone choose to farm if it were not for irrepressible love? Yes, farm laborers (and formerly enslaved Africans) were forced to plant and pick crops for corporate planters in earlier times and during the past century for huge agribusiness concerns, but they too came (and still come) from peasant, farming cultures and would prefer to farm their own land. The settlers came for land – those Scots-Irish, Germans, Japanese, and so many other peasants from faraway places where their land had been seized. Armies assisted in pushing Native farmers off the land they farmed or where they followed the game, so that immigrant peasants could own a piece of land, only to lose it through intentional government policies, supposedly to create "efficiency".

What happens to a society that literally loses its roots in the earth? We take for granted that certain people are born to music or mechanics, to the word or creating art out of whatever is at hand. Others of us may be able to learn art, music, or mechanics, but we were not destined for it. May there not be those whose heart is in the earth, in tending it, in planting, growing, and harvesting? What becomes of those so born and their progeny? They become throwaway people, no longer needed. Yet, we still need to eat the fruit of the earth, or for that matter, the bounty of the sea – I expect the same applies to fishermen. Why do we, as a society, choose to replace ten thousand farmers with an absentee corporation? It isn't more productive, but even if it were, is it practical to destroy the lives of so many who want only to farm? U.S. administrations have been trying to destroy individual farming in distant lands with their free trade agreements–World Trade Organization, the North American Free Trade Association, and one with Central America, Latin America. Mexico changed its constitution to do away with the *ejido*, the land-reform measure from the Mexican Revolution in the early 1900s, driving millions of farmers off the land and to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the U.S. border to cross illegally for jobs. China is doing away with the collective farms that have been so successful in feeding its vast population, most of whom were starving before the Chinese Revolution. French and Japanese protection of small farmers has been challenged by the United States.

My father was a born farmer, and he never owned his own farm, rather rented and sharecropped. When he could no longer do that because the medium sized farmers who employed him also went under and were replaced by corporations, something in him died. The second half of his life – he died at age 93 – was painful. I never understood this until in the process of writing *Red Dirt* I realized his tragedy, and ours as a society, although I doubt that he could have enunciated it.

This is not to say that everyone would want to return to farming the land, and I am one who would not, even if I could. All the same, two per cent of the population still working the land is far too few to provide the balance a society requires. Farmers fought hard and long to stay on the land. They fought throughout the nineteenth century, through the 1930s, and were finally crushed by the Great Depression and drought – the Dust Bowl days. Even then, they could have survived with government assistance, but the New Deal allowed banks to foreclose and destroy surplus food production to maintain high prices, while people were starving. The government could have bought and distributed the food they destroyed ("dumped in the ocean," my father used to say). So much for the free market – "free" only with government intervention on the side of the corporations and finance capital. Then the Dust Bowl refugees were put to work picking cotton and fruit for agribusiness in California, the Northwest, and Arizona, until the war industry grew, and they went to work in defense plants.

So now we have all those angry ex-farmers and wannabe farmers making bombs and fighter planes, whole new generations following in that grim work, many others serving in the military, now a business, not a civic duty. They get to drop the bombs and man the guns on the tanks that the others manufacture. Subsistence farmers, small farmers like peace not war that takes away their young sons, and now daughters. Getting rid of farmers, reducing them to a tiny minority, has made war recruiting and passive acceptance of war much easier than during World War I, when farmers rose up in rebellion, as did workers, against a "war for big business," which all modern wars are. Why would we be surprised by increased violence (requiring more jails and cops than schools and teachers)? Why be surprised that blind patriotism and promise of heaven after death, even apocalypse, as in the Book of Revelations, would replace love of the land and of all living things?

And consider all that land given to agribusiness, drying up the aquifers, poisoning the air and soil with nitrates from fertilizers, spraying pesticides, and now genetically modified plants.

In the decade since *Red Dirt* was published, since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on U.S. military and business sites – *the* symbols of each, the Pentagon and the World Trade towers – the world is said to have changed irrevocably. It is said that we are living in wartime, even World War III. Like the other world wars, it is said that this new war is the war to end all wars, that while war for the control of outer space is being prepared.

What happens to a society that literally loses its roots in the earth?

As a historian, I know that these grand pronouncements about sudden and drastic change are wrong and dangerous to our mental and physical well-being. Islam is portrayed as a powerful force in the world, an amazing claim since it has no army, no planes from which to rain bombs, no media access or control. Twenty years ago, we were told that Nicaragua and Cuba were poised to invade the U.S., and a movie that dramatized such an unlikely scenario, *Red Dawn*, was screened in Reagan's White House. Twenty years before that, the "yellow hordes" of Asia were intent on crushing us, so we must occupy, slaughter civilians, and hang tight in Southeast Asia.

My father died in June 2001, two months before what would have been his 94th birthday. It had been nearly a year since I had spent two hot, humid days with him, when we actually had said our goodbyes. He didn't have any life-threatening illness, but his will to live had been waning since his companion – my step-mother – of more than forty years suddenly had died of a heart attack in 1998. My brother Fred, being the only one of us siblings still living in Oklahoma, had cared for his needs for years, but had forced him into a hospice a couple of months before he died. My other brother, my sister, and I, all living in California, went back for the burial. There was no funeral ceremony in a church, as my father never attended church, but there was a small ceremony officiated by my brother at the burial site in Matthewson cemetery, just outside of Piedmont, where most of our relatives were buried. Besides us siblings, a few of our first cousins were there, ones who had idolized my father. We each said a few words. In the casket, Daddy looked peaceful, but determined as ever. As I had realized when I reconciled with him a decade earlier, I miss him terribly and both salute and mourn his life. He didn't like this book much because, he said, it made him appear unable to support his family, something I did not intend and don't believe I wrote or implied. On the contrary, I marvel at how the poor survive in this rich country. Had I been in charge of his tombstone, I would have written:

Here lies a farmer, whose dreams were killed by the greed of the wealthy. CP

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year $40 Two yrs $70
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $12.50 for Canadian and $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want Counter-Punch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Cindy** *continued from page 1)*

To be effective, the opinion of ordinary people has to be harnessed into a powerful political movement that offers energetic leadership.

Here the picture is dismayingly cloudy. MoveOn.org, has used Sheehan's siege of Bush as springboard to mount supportive anti-war vigils. But what exactly is MoveOn calling for, in terms of ending the war?

Go to the website of the Win Without War coalition, of which MoveOn is a member along with groups ranging from the Sierra Club, to National Organization of Women to the Methodists, Unitarians and Quakers and you'll find a mush-mouth statement about "a gradual, phased decrease in numbers rather than augmenting the size of the force", plus other familiar boilerplate about how the UN Security Council "should authorize and encourage the creation of an international stabilization force to assist the Iraqi authorities with security and training of Iraqi forces."

This leisurely agenda doesn't add up to anti-war leadership. After all, Gen. George Casey, the US commander in Iraq, talks bluntly about "some fairly substantial reductions" to start next spring.

It's no secret why MoveOn and Win Without War are so timid. Square in their field of vision is the Democratic Party whose high-profile congressional leaders such as Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden are calling for more troops to be shipped out to Iraq. Push comes to shove, most of the Win Without War coalition members won't get more than half a beat out of step with the Democrats.

Serious resistance, of the sort Sheehan calls for, has to throw the threat of popular sanction over both Democrats as well as Republicans. What leadership is available for this task? The obvious candidate is the United for Peace and Justice coalition, which mounted the huge anti-war protests of 2003 and which has been conducting peace actions ever since.

But as it organizes its upcoming September 24-26 rallies in Washington DC UFPJ seems to be turning its back on the rich opportunities for mainstream organizing offered by Sheehan and the nerveless platform of Win Without War, preferring to dilute the Out of Iraq message with cumbersome left agendas written by ultras from the casting couch of the Life of Brian.

Anyone can go on a vigil. It only costs the price of a candle and a solemn expression. The price of entry into serious anti-war organizing at the crucial moment is steeper. It requires political nerve. A substantial coalition has to lead the way, pointed to by Sheehan, with the slogan Bring Them Home Now.

What truly frightens governments is mutiny or the threat of mutiny. It was soldiers shooting their officers and sailors pushing planes off aircraft carriers that prompted the Pentagon to run up the white flag in Vietnam. Along that same spectrum is draft resistance, and the refusal to go to war. Already that's had an effect. The Pentagon says the reserve system is in ruins.

Gold Star mothers like Cindy Sheehan could be leading sit-ins at military recruitment offices across the country and in the home district congressional offices of Democrats and Republicans. How about Cindy Sheehan moving Camp Casey from Crawford to Hillary Clinton's offices in Washington or New York. Only this time the demand would not be for a meeting but for a reversal of HRC's pro war position which has her putting up a bill to increase US forces overall by 90,000. One of the greatest achievements of the anti-war movement in Vietnam era was to make it untenable for a Democrat, LBJ, to run again for the presidency, or for Hubert Humphrey to run and win on a prowar platform. Question, would the MoveOn operation take the slightest interest in any vigils outside HRC's offices, or those of any other prominent Democrat? Of course not.

Cindy Sheehan frightens the right and stirs them to venom, and she frightens the Democrats too, because she's so clear. Contrast the timeline of Sheehan to that of even a relatively decent Democrat like Russ Feingold. Feingold calls for a start to withdrawal from Iraq maybe sixteen months from now. How many dead troops and new Gold Star moms can you fit into that calendar. A thousand or more? Sheehan's Out Now call should be the bright-line test for any antiwar spokesperson. CP

Note from AC: This is a slightly abbreviated version of a piece that ran in my 8/20-21 weekend diary on our website,. It was well received, and I would like to make it available for those among our subscribers who read only this newsletter.

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Phone 1-800-840-3683 for our new t-shirts and for advance orders of CounterPunch's new book The Case Against Israel *by Michael Neumann.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED